

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BON1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,120	•	08/21/2003	Wai T. Chan	IBX-006	6673
51414	7590	06/28/2006		EXAMINER	
GOODWI PATENT A			STARKS, WILBERT L		
EXCHANGE EXCHANGE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON,	MA 021	.09-2881	2129		
•				DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/645,120	CHAN ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Wilbert L. Starks, Jr.	2129				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING resions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by started the period by the Office later than three months after the main patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be lod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for tute, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. It timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21	1 August 2003.					
•	-	his action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
•	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
,—	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
·	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmer	nt(s)	,					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ					
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date		al Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

1. 35 U.S.C. §101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the invention as disclosed in claims 1-22 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

2. Regardless of whether any of the claims are in the technological arts, none of them is limited to practical applications in the technological arts. Examiner finds that *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994) controls the 35 U.S.C. §101 issues on that point for reasons made clear by the Federal Circuit in *AT&T Corp.*v. Excel Communications, Inc., 50 USPQ2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Specifically, the Federal Circuit held that the act of:

...[T]aking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. *AT&T v. Excel* at 1453 quoting *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Examiner finds that Applicant's "plurality of input variables" references are just such abstract ideas.

3. Examiner bases his position upon guidance provided by the Federal Circuit in *In* re Warmerdam, as interpreted by AT&T v. Excel. This set of precedents is within the

Art Unit: 2129

same line of cases as the *Alappat-State Street Bank* decisions and is in complete agreement with those decisions. *Warmerdam* is consistent with *State Street*'s holding that:

Today we hold that the transformation of data, representing <u>discrete dollar amounts</u>, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation because it produces 'a useful, concrete and tangible result" -- a final share price momentarily fixed for recording purposes and even accepted and relied upon by regulatory authorities and in subsequent trades. (emphasis added) State Street Bank at 1601.

- 4. True enough, that case later eliminated the "business method exception" in order to show that business methods were not per se nonstatutory, but the court clearly *did not* go so far as to make business methods *per se statutory*. A plain reading of the excerpt above shows that the Court was *very specific* in its definition of the new *practical application*. It would have been much easier for the court to say that "business methods were per se statutory" than it was to define the practical application in the case as "...the transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price..."
- 5. The court was being very specific.
- 6. Additionally, the court was also careful to specify that the "useful, concrete and tangible result" it found was "a final share price momentarily fixed for recording purposes and even accepted and <u>relied upon</u> by regulatory authorities and in subsequent <u>trades</u>." (i.e. the trading activity is the <u>further practical use</u> of the real world

Art Unit: 2129

monetary data beyond the transformation in the computer – i.e., "post-processing activity".)

7. Applicant cites no such specific results to define a useful, concrete and tangible result. Neither does Applicant specify the associated practical application with the kind of specificity the Federal Circuit used.

8. Furthermore, in the case *In re Warmerdam*, the Federal Circuit held that:

...[The dispositive issue for assessing compliance with Section 101 in this case is whether the claim is for a process that goes beyond simply manipulating 'abstract ideas' or 'natural phenomena' ... As the Supreme Court has made clear, '[a]n idea of itself is not patentable, ... taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation. In re Warmerdam 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (emphasis added).

Application/Control Number: 10/645,120

Page 5

Art Unit: 2129

9. Since the Federal Circuit held in *Warmerdam* that this is the "dispositive issue" when it judged the usefulness, concreteness, and tangibility of the claim limitations in that case, Examiner in the present case views this holding as the dispositive issue for determining whether a claim is "useful, concrete, and tangible" in similar cases.

Accordingly, the Examiner finds that Applicant manipulated a set of abstract "input variables" to solve purely algorithmic problems in the abstract (i.e., what *kind* of "input variable" is used? Heart rhythm data? Algebraic equations? Boolean logic problems? Fuzzy logic algorithms? Probabilistic word problems? Philosophical ideas? Even vague expressions, about which even reasonable persons could differ as to their meaning? Combinations thereof?) Clearly, a claim for manipulation of "plurality of input variables" is provably even more abstract (and thereby less limited in practical application) than pure "mathematical algorithms" which the Supreme Court has held are per se nonstatutory – in fact, it *includes* the expression of nonstatutory mathematical algorithms.

10. Since the claims are not limited to <u>exclude</u> such abstractions, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim limitations <u>includes</u> such abstractions. Therefore, the claims are impermissibly abstract under 35 U.S.C. §101 doctrine.

Art Unit: 2129

11. Since *Warmerdam* is within the *Alappat-State Street Bank* line of cases, it takes the same view of "useful, concrete, and tangible" the Federal Circuit applied in *State Street Bank*. Therefore, under *State Street Bank*, this could not be a "useful, concrete and tangible result". There is only manipulation of abstract ideas.

12. The Federal Circuit validated the use of *Warmerdam* in its more recent *AT&T*Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc. decision. The Court reminded us that:

Finally, the decision in In re Warmerdam, 33 F.3d 1354, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994) is not to the contrary. *** The court found that the claimed process did nothing more than manipulate basic mathematical constructs and concluded that 'taking several abstract ideas and manipulating them together adds nothing to the basic equation'; hence, the court held that the claims were properly rejected under §101 ... Whether one agrees with the court's conclusion on the facts, the holding of the case is a straightforward application of the basic principle that mere laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas are not within the categories of inventions or discoveries that may be patented under §101. (emphasis added) AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., 50 USPQ2d 1447, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

- 13. Remember that in *In re Warmerdam*, the Court said that this was the dispositive issue to be considered. In the *AT&T* decision cited above, the Court reaffirms that this is the issue for assessing the "useful, concrete, and tangible" nature of a set of claims under 101 doctrine. Accordingly, Examiner views the *Warmerdam* holding as the dispositive issue in this analogous case.
- 14. The fact that the invention is merely the manipulation of *abstract ideas* is clear. The data referred to by Applicant's phrase "plurality of input variables" is simply an abstract construct that does not provide <u>limitations</u> in the claims to the transformation of real world data (such as monetary data or heart rhythm data) by some disclosed process. Consequently, the necessary conclusion under *AT&T*, *State Street* and

Art Unit: 2129

Warmerdam, is straightforward and clear. The claims take several abstract ideas (i.e., "plurality of input variables" in the abstract) and manipulate them together adding nothing to the basic equation. Claims 1-22 are, thereby, rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph because current case law (and accordingly, the MPEP) require such a rejection if a §101 rejection is given because when Applicant has not in fact disclosed the practical application for the invention, as a matter of law there is no way Applicant could have disclosed how to practice the *undisclosed* practical application. This is how the MPEP puts it:

("The how to use prong of section 112 incorporates as a matter of law the requirement of 35 U.S.C. §101 that the specification disclose as a matter of fact a practical utility for the invention.... If the application fails as a matter of fact to satisfy 35 U.S.C. §101, then the application also fails as a matter of law to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use the invention under 35 U.S.C. §112."); In re Kirk, 376 F.2d 936, 942, 153 USPQ 48, 53 (CCPA 1967) ("Necessarily, compliance with § 112 requires a description of how to use presently useful inventions, otherwise an applicant would anomalously be required to teach how to use a useless invention.") See, MPEP 2107.01(IV), quoting In re Kirk (emphasis added).

Therefore, claims 1-22 are rejected on this basis.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2129

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Specht; Donald Francis et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,787,747 B2; dated 07 SEP A. 2004; class 250; subclass 201.3) discloses a fast phase diversity wavefront correction using a neural network.

Kephart; Jeffrey Owen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,907,834 A; dated 25 MAY B. 1999; class 706; subclass 020) discloses a method and apparatus for detecting a presence of a computer virus.

Kephart; Jeffrey Owen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,675,711 A; dated 07 OCT C. 1997; class 706; subclass 012) discloses an adaptive statistical regression and classification of data strings, with application to the generic detection of computer viruses.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Wilbert L. Starks, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3691.

Alternatively, inquiries may be directed to the following:

Wilbert L. Starks, Jr.
Primary 2121

Art Unit - 2121 S. P. E. David Vincent (571) 272-3080

(571) 273-8300 Official (FAX)

WLS

23 June 2006